UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,891	03/30/2001	Ray Bentley	36488-169756	4447

26694   7590   09/02/2005
VENABLE LLP
P.O. BOX 34385
WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998

EXAMINER
FRANCIS, MARK P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 June 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25 and 32-42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25 and 32-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>5/26/05</u>.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment filed June 02, 2005.

2.   Per applicants' request, claims 1,11,25, and 32 have been amended and claims

26-31 have been cancelled.

Response to Amendments

3.   The objection of claims 15 and 19 as containing minor informalities is

withdrawn in view of applicant's response.

The objection of claims 16,20, and 21 as being of improper dependent form for

failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim is withdrawn in view of

applicant's response.

The rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter is

withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

The rejection of claims 1,11, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being

directed to non-statutory subject matter is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-25 and 32-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Dingman (U.S. Pat 6,820,135) in view Khoyi.(U.S. Pat 5,303,379).

Regarding claims 1,3,6,11,25,32, and 42,

Dingman discloses a method for lossless manipulation of data between different

formats, comprising: receiving a first file containing first data in a first format;(See

Abstract, lines 1-5, "transforms data received..." and Col 13, lines 41-46, "...the data

source may be a file stored...")

converting the data in the first file into second data in a second format; (Col 2, lines 6-

14, "The process of converting...")

preserving first data in the first file that cannot be represented in the second format;(Col

29, lines 22-38, "...Reject targets may be used to store records..." and Col 26 lines 53-

56, "...writing the source code record to an exceptions file."))

changing the second data while it is in the second format; (Col 30, lines 33-44, "...data

changes are evaluated...")but does not disclose directly applying the changes to the

second data in the second format to the first data in the first file.

Khoyi discloses directly applying the changes to the second data in the second format

to the first data in the first file(Col 50:7-27, "...for converting data between...native data

format and certain foreign data formats...",Col 81:37-50, "...Changes that have been

made to a resource file can be incorporated into the permanent copy of the file,...") in

an analogous system for the purpose of providing for a highly integrate, yet extensible

system by means of typed objects, object managers, and a generalized invocation

mechanism that invokes an appropriate object manager to perform an operation on an

object.(Khoyi: Col 2:55-60)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to directly apply changes to data in a second format to the first format of

Dingman's invention.

The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to provide for a highly integrate, yet extensible system by means

of typed objects, object managers, and a generalized invocation mechanism that

invokes an appropriate object manager to perform an operation on an object.(Khoyi: Col

2:55-60)

With respect to claims 2 and 16, Dingman teaches wherein steps c) and d) comprise:

creating a list of the key values for entities in the second data that have been changed;

(Col 4, lines 49-52, "...of the records by key values...")

locating entities in the first data corresponding to the entities in the second data that

have been changed based on the key value; (Col 15, lines 48-67, "...specifying where

the data from the source should..." and Col 16, lines ALL "...When the user specifies

an expression..." Col 17, lines ALL)

and making the tracked changes(Col 34, lines 24-28, " The user is able to perform

basic management operations...") directly to the corresponding entities in the first data.

(Col 32, lines 5-67 and Col 33, lines 32-51, "These changes in the ...")

With respect to claims 4,17,and 38, Dingman teaches further comprising: maintaining a

representation of each entity in the second data in the native format before editing;(Col

33, lines 15-45, "template transformations can be first be created...")

maintaining a representation of each entity in the second data in the native format after

editing;(Col 33, lines 15-51, "...can then be called and edited...")

and comparing the representations to determine changes made to the entities. (Col 33,

lines 40-51, "These changes in the transformation can...")

With respect to claim 5, Dingman teaches further comprising converting only data in the

foreign format that has a corresponding container in the native format.(Col 6, lines 9-30,

"...relates one or more source structures to one or more target structures...")

With respect to claim 7, Dingman teaches wherein the altering step is performed after

editing is completed. (Col 33, lines 15-51, "...can then be called and edited...")

With respect to claims 8 and 19, Dingman teaches wherein the changes included at

least one of addition, deletion, or modification of the data. (Col 1, lines 54-64,

"...Common content changes include adding, deleting, aggregating, concatenating, and otherwise...")

With respect to claims 9,22, and 39, Dingman teaches further comprising creating a representation of the converted data in memory only.(Col 27, lines 41-66 and Col 28, lines 1-4, " Put-writes the data in the target record memory buffer into the data target...")

With respect to claims 10,23, and 40, Dingman teaches further comprising deleting the second data from memory after an editing session ends. (Col 10, lines 40-45, "...with the transformation results (insert, update, or delete)."

With respect to claims 12 and 33, Dingman teaches wherein the first and second data comprise a plurality of entities. (Col 5, lines 1-22, "...that describe a specific entity. Also known as a record.")

With respect to claims 13,24,34, and 41, Dingman teaches wherein the steps further comprise: determining a relationship between entities in the first data; (Col 6, lines 49-60, "...to define the relationship between one or more data sources...")
determining a mapping between the entities in the first data; (Col 6, lines 22-30, "...a transformation map that comprises one or more mappings..." and Col 15, lines 49-62, "define the transformation map by specifying where the data from the source should appear in the data target as well as the relationship...")

and altering the mapping of the entities in the first data based on the editing session, if

necessary. (Col 15, lines 64-67, "...visual mapping interface... and Col 16, lines 1-45,

"...The present invention contemplates the use of expressions when defining the

mapping between source and target data...")

With respect to claims 14,15,35,and 36, Dingman teaches further comprising:

determining the key value for each entity in the first data;(Col 10, lines 40-35, "..to

determine record types...")

and using the same key value as the first data to identify corresponding entities in the

second data. (Col 5, lines 10-20, ... "Certain fields may be designated as keys,...")

With respect to claims 16 and 37, Dingman teaches wherein steps d) and e) comprises:

creating a list of the key values for entities in the second data changed during editing;

(Col 5, lines 10-20, "Certain fields may be designated as keys..."

locating the corresponding entity in the first data based on the key value; (Col 15, lines

48-67, "...specifying where the data from the source should..." and Col 16, lines ALL

"...When the user specifies an expression..." Col 17, lines ALL)

and making the change directly to the corresponding entity in the first data. .(Col 31,

lines 50-60, "After this transformation is executed..." and (Col 32, lines 5-67 and Col 33,

lines 32-51, "These changes in the ..." and Col 8, lines 33-57, "...to retrieve and write

data to the data structures in a source or target...")

With respect to claim 18, Dingman teaches wherein only entities that have been changed in the second data are changed in the first data.(Col 15, lines 49-62, "The user may define the transformation map by specifying where the data from the source should appear in the data target... remove unwanted characters...")

With respect to claim 20, Dingman teaches wherein the change comprises deleting an entity. (Col 15, lines 49-62, "The user may define the transformation map by specifying where the data from the source should appear in the data target... remove unwanted characters...")

and step d) comprises locating(Col 4, lines 49-52, "...indexed retrieval of the records by key values.") and deleting an entity with a corresponding key value in the foreign file and deleting it.(Col 33, lines 52-67, "Project steps can be re-arrranged, deleted, added, or edited..." and Col 34, lines 1-5).

With respect to claim 21, Dingman teaches wherein the change comprises adding a new entity (Col 34, lines 19-28, "...basic management operations on the database contents(new, delete, edit, export, import...")

and step d) comprises creating a representation of the new entity in the foreign format, determining a key value for the new entity,(Col 26, lines 31-41, "...used to validate target values...")

and associating the representation with the new key value.(Col 26,lines 42-48, "…is

triggered just after a target record is sent to the target.")

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed on April 18, 2005 have been fully considered with

respect to claim1-25 and 32-42 but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until afterthe end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mark P. Francis whose telephone number is (571)272-

7956. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)272-3719. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER